DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 259 24 EA 001 622

By-Dietrich, John E.

A CONFERENCE TO STIMULATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON CURRICULAR AND INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATIONS IN LARGE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES. FINAL REPORT.

Michigan State Univ., East Lansing.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-6-2606
Pub Date Dec 66
Contract-OEC-3-6-062606-1049
Note-38p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.60
Descriptors-CONFERENCES, *CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, *EDUCATIONAL EXPERIMENTS, *EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, HIGHER EDUCATION, INFORMATION DISSEMINATION, *INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION

This document discusses the plans and the implementation of plans for the National Conference on Curricular and Instructional Innovation for Large Colleges and Universities, held at Michigan State University, November 6-11, 1966. The purposes of the conference were (1) to identify through discussion and demonstration promising curricular and instructional innovations in large American colleges and univ'rsities, (2) to stimulate research and development, and (3) to disseminate information on curricular and instructional innovation to institutions of higher education. A list of the conference participants and a conference critique by B. Lamar Johnson are appended. (HW)

BR-6-2606
PA-24

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 6-2606 PA-24
Contract No. OEC3-6-062606-1049

A CONFERENCE TO STIMULATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON CURRICULAR AND INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATIONS IN LARGE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

December, 1966

ED022259
EA 001 622

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

A CONFERENCE TO STIMULATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON CURRICULAR AND INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATIONS IN LARGE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Project No. 6-2606
Contract No. OEC3-6-062606-1049

John E. Dietrich

December, 1966

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Michigan State University

East Lansing, Michigan

III. Introduction

A. The Problem

While the specific topics of the conference were established by the planning committee, some general problems were proposed for the committee's consideration.[1] These included:

1. For what kind of a world should today's students be educated?

2. What special curriculum planning problems do large colleges and universities have?

3. What is the meaning of curriculum in higher education and how should it be studied?

4. How can curricular and instructional innovations become integrated into the university as a whole?

5. What kind of evaluation of an innovation is meaningful to faculty and administrators not directly involved in the development process?

6. What research and development gaps exist and how should they be filled?

7. Should faculty be encouraged to innovate with curriculum and instruction? How can this be made possible?

8. What are the elements of an institutional climate that is favorable to innovation?

9. Should students be involved in curriculum planning?

10. What is the role of the state legislatures in curriculum planning?

---

[1]These and other issues are well documented by Samuel Baskin, "Higher Education: Some Newer Developments" (McGraw Hill, 1965), Clark Kerr, "The Uses of the University" (Harvard, 1963), Robert W. Heath, "New Curricula" (Harper, 1964), and Paul L. Dressel, "The Undergraduate Curriculum in Higher Education," (The Library of Education, 1963).

B. Objectives

1. To identify and explore through discussion and demonstration promising curricular and instructional innovation in large American colleges and universities.

2. To stimulate research and development where needed.

3. To disseminate information on curricular and instructional innovation to institutions of higher education.

IV. Methods

A. Conference Planning

A seven member planning committee met May 10, 1966. This committee included:

National Planning Committee

John E. Dietrich
Assistant Provost
Michigan State University
Chairman

Kevin P. Bunnell
Associate Director
Western Interstate Commission
for Higher Education
Boulder, Colorado

Daniel Fader
Assistant Professor
Department of English
University of Michigan

Margaret H. Merry, President
Wheelock College
Boston, Massachusetts

James L. Miller, Jr.
Associate Director for Research
Southern Regional Education Board
Atlanta, Georgia

Allen W. Ostar
Executive Director
Association of State Colleges
and Universities
Washington, D. C.

Dewey B. Stuit, Dean
College of Liberal Arts
University of Iowa

U. S. Office of Education Liaison

Clarence B. Lindquist
Specialist
Mathematics and Physical Science
Division of Higher Education
Research

Michigan State University Staff

F. Craig Johnson
Conference Coordinator

John A. Waite
Associate Coordinator

William M. Ozburn
Kellogg Center Coordinator

Dr. J. Richard Suchman, then Acting Director, Division of Higher Education Research, reviewed for the committee the history and impact of previous government sponsored conferences. Several key issues were introduced which tended to set the patterns for this conference. These included in Suchman's words:

1. Purpose: "The greatest product of any conference is the organic growth of the group, the change within the people who are present and the interchange of ideas and values."

2. Format: "The innovation conference being planned in November should have very little structuring."

3. Content: "Bring people to discuss what a university is about."

4. Dissemination: "The report to the USOE could be nothing more than an accounting of the ideas that emerged or a description of what happened."

The planning committee then made several specific decisions regarding the conference:

Location:

Kellogg Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

Dates:

November 6, 6:00 p.m. to November 11, 12 noon.

Format:

1. The evening opening the conference will include a reception, a dinner, and an address by President John A. Hannah, Michigan State University.

2. At the morning sessions of each day (November 7-10) prepared replies will be made to the papers written for the conference, followed by a general discussion.

3. During the afternoon sessions of each day, participants will be asked to comment on the relevant topic for the day relating it to problems at their home institutions. Some workshop sessions will be scheduled to outline the details of problems and suggest criteria for evaluating solutions.

4. Evenings are to be left open for informal discussions, optional demonstrations or tours, and for two scheduled dinner addresses.

5. The final morning session will include an evaluation of the conference.

Participants:

1. Participants will be selected by the planning committee, using participant quality as the overriding criterion. A balance among size of institution, position of participants, and subject matter areas will guide final selection. Several students will be nominated and a number will be selected.

2. Each participant will be asked to abstract several innovational projects current on his campus and submit them prior to the conference.

Authors:

1. Four authors will be invited to prepare papers on selected topics.

2. Each author will prepare his paper well in advance of the conference and then on the day assigned will lead a discussion of the topic based on his paper.

Speakers:

In addition to the opening address by President Hannah, two other national leaders will be invited to address the conference.

Dissemination:

A formal report will be drawn up at the end of the conference and will include all major papers.

The U. S. Office of Education suggested the following on June 30, 1966:

1. To make the conference more flexible and less structured.

2. To have substantial student involvement and participation.

3. To select conferees on the basis of their quality and expected contribution to conference aims rather than on the basis of their university affiliation.

4. To restrict the number of speeches by "eminent" authorities to three people.

5. To provide more working sessions that will lead participants to produce worthy proposals and needed change.

The suggestions by Dr. Suchman, the planning committee, and the U. S. Office of Education formed the basic guideline for the conference.

B. Implementing the Planning

Location:

Confirmed with Kellogg Center July 1, 1966.

Dates:

Confirmed with Kellogg Center July 1, 1966.

Format:

The flexible and less structured format recommended by the USOE was established and provided working sessions. The resulting conference program is attached. (Appendix A.)

Participants:

Fifty-three invitations were sent August 1 to people selected by the planning committee, the USOE, and the conference staff. Of this group, nineteen attended the conference.

Twenty-two invitations were sent September 8 to people suggested by the planning committee, the USOE, and the conference staff. Nine of this group attended the conference.

Eight invitations were sent to students October 1, 1966 from nomination by the planning committee, the USOE, and the conference staff. Three of this group attended the conference.

Using these thirty-one people as a base, additional people were invited based on their quality and expected contribution to conference aims. A balance among size of institution, position of participants, and subject matter guided final selection. A final list of participants is attached. (Appendix B.) Each participant prepared several abstracts of innovational projects prior to the conference.

Authors:

Four authors were invited to prepare papers on selected topics. These papers were distributed in advance to all participants: (See Supplement for text.)

"The Need for Curricular and Instructional Change with Some Examples of Curriculum Innovation and Evaluation," by Russell M. Cooper, Dean, College of Liberal Arts, University of South Florida.

"Personalizing Instruction in Mass Education by Innovations in the Teaching-Learning Process," by Launor F. Carter, Vice President, System Development Corporation.

"The Use of Human and Technological Resources in Instruction and the Changing Role of the Professor and Student," by C. Ray Carpenter, Professor, Psychology and Anthropology, Pennsylvania State University.

"Sociological Problems of Innovation: Strategies for Change in a Complex Institution," by Everett M. Rogers, Associate Professor, Department of Communication, Michigan State University.

Speakers:

In addition to the papers prepared for the conference, three other national leaders addressed the conference at the optional evening dinners: (See Supplement for text.)

"Developing a Tradition of Innovation," by John A. Hannah, President, Michigan State University.

"Regurgitation or Dialogue: The Key Issue," by Robert Theobald, Author and Lecturer, New York, New York.

"Innovations in Large Colleges and Universities and the Federal Government: An Appraisal," by Paul A. Miller, Assistant Secretary for Education, Department of Health Education and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

Dissemination:

It was the desire of the planning committee to distribute to each participant the proceedings of the conference with extra copies available on request from each large college and university represented. The reduction of the proposed budget item from $3,000 to $500 foreclosed this possibility. Instead a complete set of conference papers and abstracts was given to each participant at the time of the conference.

V. Results

The conference was held at Kellogg Center, Michigan State University, November 6-11, 1966.

The conference was attended by:

12 vice presidents
7 deans
16 directors of all-university offices
16 faculty members
4 foundation representatives
6 students
7 speakers
3 members of the planning committee
71 people at conference expense

and

1 director of an all-university office
1 student
2 speakers
2 foundation representatives
9 government representatives
15 people at no expense to the conference

VI. Discussion

Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, University of California, Los Angeles, was commissioned to discuss the conference. His report is attached. (Appendix C.)

VII. Conclusions and Implications

A. Conclusions

The general observations of Dr. B. Lamar Johnson tend to support the notion that this conference did follow the general guidelines established by Dr. Suchman and the planning committee. The criteria Dr. Suchman outlined for judging the success of the conference included the following:

"The degree to which it is obvious that groups of people are doing things that can be traced back to the conference."

"Any evidence of new things being tried out that weren't being done before."

"The commitments of the participants to innovation."

With the criteria for evaluation established in terms of long-range effects on participants, final conclusion on the ultimate success or failure of the conference cannot be written at this time.

B. Implications

If the U. S. Office of Education elects to continue to support conferences of this nature, it would seem that the ultimate impact may not be known for quite some time. Many participants have observed that the conference they attended was not the conference they had expected to attend.

Examination of the objectives of the conference (see Objectives, page 3) indicates that it was the original intent of the planning group that the conference be action-centered. At the same time, the recommendations of Dr. Suchman (see page 5) and the U. S. Office of Education (see page 7) provided a broad, highly flexible concept and approach. These two opposing forces caused the conference in many instances to leave the subject of specific curricular and instructional innovation and caused it to turn to the broader questions of "what a university is about" (Suchman). It is for these reasons that many "action-centered" participants felt that the conference did not lead to sufficient specific recommendations for action. Simultaneously, the "nature of a university" participants felt at times that the conference was too pedantically action-centered.

The dozens of comments and letters received by this office lead us to believe that the conference represented a highly successful fusion of these two radically different points of view.

However, it may be necessary in the future to explain in more detail to people when they are invited that conferences of this type are not conventional. This may bring their expectations closer to the experience of the conference.

VIII. Summary

During November 6-11, 1966, a National Conference on Curricular and Instructional Innovation for Large Colleges and Universities was held at Michigan State University. The purposes were:

1. To identify and explore through discussion and demonstration promising curricular and instructional innovations in large American colleges and universities.

2. To stimulate research and development.

3. To disseminate information on curricular and instructional innovation to institutions of higher education.

To accomplish these purposes the following procedures were followed:

1. A seven member planning committee was established.

2. Topics were selected for five invited working papers.

3. Authors of working papers were commissioned.

4. Four of the working papers were distributed to all participants prior to the conference.

5. Each participant prepared several abstracts of innovations at his home institution. These abstracts were reproduced and distributed to all participants at the conference.

6. The conference proceedings, including the four working papers, the evaluation by Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, and the abstracts have been disseminated to the participants.

The results of the conference will not be known for some time. The criteria for evaluation established by the U. S. Office of Education use the effect on the participants long-range action as the indicator of success. Future analysis of this effect may provide an evaluation of the conference in these terms.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CURRICULAR AND INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION

for Large Colleges and Universities

November 6 - 11, 1966

Michigan State University

Kellogg Center

East Lansing, Michigan

Appendix A

SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

nday, November 6

:00 p.m. Registration of participants.

:00 p.m. Reception with participants and invited guests from Michigan State University.

:00 p.m. Dinner.

:00 p.m. Introduction—Howard R. Neville, Provost, Michigan State University.
Keynote address—John A. Hannah, President, Michigan State University.

onday, November 7

:00 a.m. Discussion of conference objectives and procedures — John E. Dietrich, Assistant Provost, Michigan State University and Conference Director.

:15 a.m. Purposes and objectives of the U. S. Office of Education in sponsoring conferences—Samuel G. Sava, Acting Director, Division of Higher Education Research, U. S. Office of Education.

:30 a.m. A verbal abstract of a paper entitled "The Need for Curricular and Instructional Change with Some Examples of Curriculum Innovation and Evaluation," by Russell M. Cooper, Dean, College of Liberal Arts, University of South Florida.

:45 a.m. Discussion by all participants.

:30 a.m. Lunch.

:00 p.m. Study sessions. (One-third of the abstracts selected for discussion.)

:00 p.m. Reports from study sessions on the pertinent comments, observations, and research hypotheses developed by the participants.

:30 p.m. End of session.

Tuesday, November 8

9:00 a.m. A verbal abstract of a paper entitled "Personalizing Instruction in Mass Education by Innovations in the Teaching-Learning Process," by Launor F. Carter, Vice President, System Development Corporation.

9:15 a.m. Begin discussion using the pattern established on Monday.

11:30 a.m. Lunch.

2:00 p.m. Study sessions. (One-third of the abstracts selected for discussion.)

4:00 p.m. Reports from study sessions.

4:30 p.m. End of session.

5:30 p.m. Social Hour.

7:00 p.m. Dinner.

8:00 p.m. Speech by Robert Theobald, Author and Lecturer, New York, New York.

Wednesday, November 9

9:00 a.m. A verbal abstract of a paper entitled "The Use of Human and Technological Resources in Instruction and the Changing Role of the Professor and Student," by C. Ray Carpenter, Professor, Psychology and Anthropology, Pennsylvania State University.

9:15 a.m. Study sessions. (One-third of the abstracts selected for discussion.)

11:00 a.m. Reports from study sessions.

11:30 a.m. Lunch.

2:00 p.m. Student panel.

3:00 p.m. Dialogue among the students, Edward J. Shoben and Robert Theobald.

4:30 p.m. End of session.

Thurs

9:00

9:15

11:30

2:00

4:00

4:30

5:30

7:00

8:00

Frida

9:00

11:30

November 8

n. A verbal abstract of a paper entitled "Personalizing Instruction in Mass Education by Innovations in the Teaching-Learning Process," by Launor F. Carter, Vice President, System Development Corporation.

m. Begin discussion using the pattern established on Monday.

m. Lunch.

m. Study sessions. (One-third of the abstracts selected for discussion.)

m. Reports from study sessions.

m. End of session.

m. Social Hour.

m. Dinner.

m. Speech by Robert Theobald, Author and Lecturer, New York, New York.

day, November 9

.m. A verbal abstract of a paper entitled "The Use of Human and Technological Resources in Instruction and the Changing Role of the Professor and Student," by C. Ray Carpenter, Professor, Psychology and Anthropology, Pennsylvania State University.

a.m. Study sessions. (One-third of the abstracts selected for discussion.)

a.m. Reports from study sessions.

a.m. Lunch.

p.m. Student panel.

p.m. Dialogue among the students, Edward J. Shoben and Robert Theobald.

p.m. End of session.

Thursday, November 10

9:00 a.m. A verbal abstract of a paper entitled "The Communication of Innovations: Strategies for Change in a Complex Institution," by Everett M. Rogers, Associate Professor, Department of Communication, Michigan State University.

9:15 a.m. Begin Discussion.

11:30 a.m. Lunch.

2:00 p.m. Study sessions.

4:00 p.m. Reports from study sessions.

4:30 p.m. End of session.

5:30 p.m. Social hour.

7:00 p.m. Dinner.

8:00 p.m. Speech by Paul A. Miller, Assistant Secretary for Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Friday, November 11

9:00 a.m. Evaluation and summary by B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education, University of California, Los Angeles, entitled "Getting Innovation Started: What To Do Next."

11:30 a.m. End of Conference.

CONFERENCE PERSONNEL

National Planning Committee

JOHN E. DIETRICH
Assistant Provost
Michigan State University
Chairman

KEVIN P. BUNNELL
Associate Director
Western Interstate Commission
for Higher Education
Boulder, Colorado

DANIEL FADER
Assistant Professor
Department of English
University of Michigan

MARGARET H. MERRY, President
Wheelock College
Boston, Massachusetts

JAMES L. MILLER, JR.
Associate Director for Research
Southern Regional Education Board
Atlanta, Georgia

ALLEN W. OSTAR
Executive Director
Association of State Colleges
and Universities
Washington, D. C.

DEWEY B. STUIT, Dean
College of Liberal Arts
University of Iowa

U. S. Office of Education Liaison

CLARENCE B. LINDQUIST
Specialist
Mathematics and Physical Science
Division of Higher Education
Research

Michigan State University Staff

F. CRAIG JOHNSON
Conference Coordinator

JOHN A. WAITE
Associate Coordinator

WILLIAM M. OZBURN
Kellogg Center Coordinator

Appendix B

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CURRICULAR AND INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION FOR LARGE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Michigan State University
Kellogg Center
East Lansing, Michigan

November 6-11, 1966

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Samuel Baskin, President
Union for Research and Experimentation in Higher Education
Antioch College

Dr. Samuel L. Becker, Professor
Speech and Dramatic Art
University of Iowa

Mrs. Cora Beebe
Program Evaluation Specialist
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Frederick deW. Bolman
Director of Special Programs
Esso Foundation

Miss Susan Boris, Student
Smith College

Dr. Willard L. Boyd, Vice President
Office of Academic Affairs
University of Iowa

Dr. Ernest Boyer, Executive Dean
The State University of New York

Dr. Samuel Braden, Vice President & Dean for Undergraduate Development
Indiana University

Mr. James W. Brann, Reporter
Chronicle of Higher Education

Dr. Kevin P. Bunnell, Associate Director
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

Dr. Russell W. Burris, Director
Center for the Study of Programed Learning
University of Minnesota

Dr. John R. Carnes, Associate Dean
College of Arts & Sciences
University of Colorado

Dr. C. Ray Carpenter, Research Professor
The Pennsylvania State University

Dr. Launor F. Carter.
Senior Vice President
System Development Corporation

Dr. E. Lawrence Chalmers, Vice President
Office of Academic Affairs
Florida State University

Dr. James W. Cleary
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
The University of Wisconsin

Dr. Lewis W. Cochran, Provost
Office of the Provost
University of Kentucky

Dr. Paul Conkin, Professor
Department of History
University of Maryland

Dr. Russell M. Cooper, Dean
College of Liberal Arts
University of South Florida

Mr. Richard Currey, Student
Michigan State University

Dr. Warren Cutts, Professor
College of Education
Florida Atlantic University

Dr. Robert H. Davis, Conference Staff

Dr. Walter H. Delaplane, Vice President
Office of Academic Affairs
University of Arizona

Dr. John E. Dietrich, Conference Staff

Dr. James Doi, Professor
Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of Michigan

Dr. Paul Dressel, Director
Institutional Research
Michigan State University

Mr. Clifford Drummond, President
Student Association
University of Texas

Mr. E. Alden Dunham
Executive Associate
Carnegie Corporation

Dr. Stanford Erickson, Director
Center for Research on Learning & Teaching
University of Michigan

Dr. Alvin C. Eurich, President
The Academy for Educational Development

Dr. Daniel Fader
Assistant Professor of English
University of Michigan

Dr. Howard F. Fehr, Head
Department of Mathematics
Teachers College
Columbia University

Dr. John Guy Fowlkes, Director
Teaching Improvement Program
University of Wisconsin

Mr. William C. Gescheider
Program Planning Officer
Bureau of Higher Education
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Hendrick D. Gideonse, Director
Program Planning and Development Staff
Bureau of Research
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Maxwell Goldberg, Associate Director
Center for Continuing Liberal Education
The Pennsylvania State University

Dr. Stuart Grout, Director
Office of Academic Planning
Boston University

Dr. John W. Gustad, Associate Dean
College of Arts and Sciences
Ohio State University

Dr. John Haney, Director
Instructional Resources Center
University of Illinois

Dr. John A. Hannah, President
Michigan State University

Dr. David L. Hattrich
Program Coordinator
Curriculum Branch
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Jack Jeffrey, Chairman
Research & Development Center for the
College Instruction of Science and
Mathematics
The University of Texas

Dr. Arno Jewett, Acting Chief
Curriculum Branch
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, Professor
Department of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

Dr. F. Craig Johnson, Conference Staff

Dr. George Johnson, Dean
College of Liberal Arts
Temple University

Dr. William M. Jones, Associate Dean
Graduate School
University of Missouri

Dr. E. Leonard Jossem, Professor
Department of Physics
Ohio State University

Dr. John Kamerick, Vice President
Kent State University

Dr. Robert M. Kamins
Dean for Academic Development
University of Hawaii

Mr. Richard Kean, Student
University of Missouri

Dr. John Kennedy, Vice President
Institute for Educational Development

Dr. Robert J. Kibler, Director
Educational Research Bureau
Southern Illinois University

Dr. L. Carroll King, Professor
Department of Chemistry
Northwestern University

Dr. George Klare, Dean
College of Arts & Sciences
Ohio University

Dr. Calvin Lee
American Council on Education

Dr. Clarence B. Lindquist, Specialist
Curriculum Branch
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Warren Martin, Professor
Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

Dr. Lewis B. Mayhew, Professor
School of Education
Stanford University

Dr. John M. Mays
Office of Science and Technology
Executive Office of the President
of the United States

Dr. Margaret H. Merry, President
Wheelock College

Dr. Charles McIntrye, Director
Office of Instructional Resources
University of Illinois

Dr. Wilbur J. McKeachie, Chairman
Department of Psychology
University of Michigan

Dr. E. P. Miles, Director
Computing Center
Florida State University

Dr. James L. Miller, Jr., Director
Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of Michigan

Dr. Paul A. Miller
Assistant Secretary of Education
Department of Health, Education & Welfare

Dr. Stuart Miller, Professor
Livingston College
Rutgers University

Dr. Ohmer Milton, Director
Learning Resources Center
University of Tennessee

Dr. Peter S. Mousolite, Director
Region V, U.S. Office of Education

Mr. Joseph A. Murnin
Region V, U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Barbara Newell
Assistant to the Chancellor
The University of Wisconsin

Dr. Ben Nichols, Professor
Department of Electrical Engineering
Cornell University

Dr. Allan W. Ostar, Executive Director
Association of State Colleges
and Universities

Dr. Eugene Oxhandler, Project Director
Center for Instructional Communications
Syracuse University

Mr. William M. Ozburn, Conference Staff

Dr. Lyle Phillips, Director
Undergraduate Science Division
National Science Foundation

Miss Vicki Pitkanen, Student
University of California, Berkeley

Dr. Lawrence Resnick, Dean
College of Arts and Sciences
The State University of New York

Dr. Everett M. Rogers
Associate Professor
Department of Communication
Michigan State University

Dr. Samuel G. Sava, Acting Director
Division of Higher Education Research
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. John Scanlon, Program Associate
The Ford Foundation

Dr. Charles F. Schuller
Conference Staff

Dr. Guenter Schwarz, Director
Center for Research in College Instruction
in Science and Mathematics
Florida State University

Dr. Warren Seibert, Head
Instructional Media Research Unit
Purdue University

Dr. E. J. Shoben, Jr.
American Council On Education

Mr. Robert J. Shulman, Student
The Ohio University

Dr. Laurence Siegel, Chairman
Department of Psychology
Louisiana State University

Dr. Bernard F. Sliger
Dean of Academic Affairs
Louisiana State University

Dr. Thomas S. Smith, Vice President
for Academic Affairs
Ohio University

Dr. John Stecklein, Director
Bureau of Institutional Research
University of Minnesota

Dr. George G. Stern, Professor
Psychological Research Center
University of Syracuse

Dr. Dewey B. Stuit, Dean
College of Liberal Arts
University of Iowa

Mr. Robert Theobald
New York, New York

Dr. Robert K. Thomas, Director
Honors Program
Bricham Young University

Dr. James B. Tintera, Professor
Division of Mass Communication
Wayne State University

Dr. Gerald M. Torkelson, Professor
College of Education
University of Washington

Dr. George E. Valley, Jr., Professor
Department of Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Dr. Walter B. Waetjen, Vice President
for Administrative Affairs
The University of Maryland

Dr. John A. Waite, Conference Staff

Dr. Charles E. Wales
Department of Chemical Engineering
Purdue University

Dr. Willard Warrington, Conference Staff

Mr. Paul Weiss, Student
Goddard College

Dr. Robert R. Wellman,
Associate Professor
School of Education
University of Massachusetts

Dr. Sylvester Whitaker, Assistant Dean
Graduate Division
University of California, Los Angeles

Dr. Robert Wigman, Associate Dean
College of Education
University of Florida

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CURRICULAR AND INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION IN LARGE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Action and Reaction: A Conference Critique

B. Lamar Johnson
University of California, Los Angeles

This conference is one of several recent or planned conferences on innovations in higher education. I should like briefly to refer to two others in which I have participated.

The first was a colloquium on experimental colleges held at Wakulla Springs, Florida in April, 1963. Sponsored by Florida State University and the Southern Regional Education Board, this conference was attended by invited representatives from ten experimental colleges and universities and a group of consultants. Conference presentations, for the most part, consisted of reports on programs and plans from each of the ten institutions. Rigorous and far-ranging discussion followed each paper.[1]

The second was the Conference on Innovation in Higher Education sponsored by the Union for Research and Experimentation in Higher Education and held at Magnolia, Massachusetts in May, 1966. This conference was sponsored by a group of ten experimental colleges, several of which had been represented at Wakulla Springs, and was financed by the United States Office of Education. In attendance were representatives - staff and students - of each sponsoring institution, and a number of invited speakers and consultants. Papers related to a variety of topics, emphases and proposals were presented; e.g., presentations

---

1. See W. Hugh Stickler, editor. Experimental Colleges: Their Role in American Higher Education. Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1964.

on the nature and rationale of experimental colleges - a report from Oklahoma Christian College on its plan of providing a carrel for every student in the college instructional resource center and a proposal for a library-centered college. Discussion groups tended to be action-centered, stressing what should next be done.

The Wakulla Springs colloquium with an attendance of some twenty-five was smaller than the present conference; and the Magnolia conference with a roster of more than one-hundred was larger. More representatives of the top echelon of the administrative power structure were present at the Florida and Massachusetts conferences than are here this week.

It is significant that conferences on innovation in higher education are being held. These gatherings clearly symptomize a demand for drastic change and for improvement as higher education is called upon to assume responsibility for educating unprecedented numbers of students. The pressure is on to improve the quality of higher education in a period of sharply increasing enrollments.

Just as Robert Pace and George Stern point out that colleges have personalities, so also may we suggest that conferences have personalities. Although it will not be my purpose to define the personality of this conference, I shall make some comments about the conference as a conference before turning to a discussion of purposes, problems, issues, and proposals.

This week's conference has obviously been carefully and effectively planned. Papers and abstract descriptions of innovative developments were prepared and distributed to us before our arrival. Since we spent little time listening to papers and speeches, we had ample time for discussion and we participated freely.

Free time available during the week made it possible to engage in informal discussions of the type that are greatly cherished by conferees. Lodging, food, physical facilities, and arrangements for the conference were superior. I am confident that we all join in expressing appreciation to Dr. Dietrich and his staff colleagues as well as his fellow members on the Planning Committee, and likewise to the Office of Education for funding the conference. This week has been a memorable experience, and we are grateful.

This conference has been less obviously and less directly action-centered than either of the other conferences to which I have referred. Please observe that I have said "less obviously and less directly action-centered." It is possible that this week's conference is in actuality action-centered. This characteristic of our sessions can be defined only after we know what happens as a consequence of our days here.

As I attend meetings, I am interested in conference vocabularies and quotable quotes. These are among terms that have attracted my attention which may suggest something of the nature of this conference:

"Gutenberg Animals"

"TNT" - Technology and Togetherness

"Living and Loving Dorms"

"The Drop-in Student" - the transfer student

"Hooked on Books" - a term created by Daniel Fader and by him used as the title of a book; but changed at this conference to "Hooked on Computers".

"Change Agent"

"Cult of Innovation"

"Professional Innovators"

Four words and the concepts which they connote have been used so repetitiously that they might possibly be referred to as thematic emphases of the conference:

Purposes
Flexibility
Evaluation
Feedback

Someone suggested that the spirit of this conference has been, "I'm from Missouri. Show me."

Your quotable quotes from the conference would undoubtedly differ from mine. Here, however, are a few that I have noted:

"A million dollar machine doing a thousand dollar job."

"Garbage in, garbage out" - referring to the fact that computer output can be no better than its input.

"Innovation is the new 'in' word."

"Multiphasic problems require pluralistic solutions."

"As a teacher the task of the professor is to be a talent scout."

"A professor who can be replaced by a machine should be."

"Teaching is a learning experience for the professor."

"Substantive innovation in our universities is unlikely."

The quote with which I at the moment find myself in greatest agreement is this:

"This conference defies summary."

In the remainder of the time at my disposal, I shall discuss five points:

Purposes of the conference
Missing Emphases
Problems
Issues
Suggestions

Purposes of the Conference

Repeatedly this week emphasis has been given to the importance of purposes: purposes as a basis for defining the role of the university; purposes as a basis for educational planning; purposes as a basis for effective teaching. Similarly, it is important to have an understanding of the purposes of this conference - as a basis for being a participant in it and as a basis for appraising what has happened here.

If I interpret the purpose of this conference correctly, it has been to stimulate an intellectual ferment which will impel participants and others who may be influenced by what goes on here to bring about curricular and instructional changes, and some would say the restructuring of American universities, that lead to increased student learning and hopefully to increased efficiency of operation.

In doing this it is anticipated that members of the conference will identify problems and issues in the curriculum and teaching, will exchange experiences, and will engage in planning.

The purposes of this conference are particularly concerned with large colleges and universities - institutions with enrollments of more than 15,000 according to my original invitation to participate in these sessions.

Missing Emphases

It is obviously impossible in a five-day period to give comprehensive consideration to the multiplicity of topics that are relevant to our purposes. Nevertheless, as I look back over the past several days, it appears to me

that there are a number of important matters which received minimal consideration. I shall refer to five.

1. The curriculum. The theme of this conference is "curricular and instructional innovation." We have, however, this week given little substantive consideration to the curriculum. We have, to be sure, discussed in general terms purposes which are basic to what is taught. Our consideration of the curriculum has, however, largely been limited to some references to interdisciplinary courses (the values of which are supported by a student who observes, "After all, life is interdisciplinary.") and to suggestions that students be taught about and given experience with computers and that cybernetics be added to the curriculum - perhaps for all students.

2. Pressure for change and improvement. This conference has by no means been a complacent assembly. In this room we have creative and imaginative minds. We have had vital discussions and suggestions of far-reaching consequence, and yet I have not felt in our discussions an impelling urgency for sound innovation. The pressure is on. Students are coming in hordes and their numbers are increasing. Costs are rising sharply and taxpayers are demanding efficiency - and in some situations threatening revolt. The times in which we live urgently demand bold and imaginative thinking, planning and action.

3. The large university. Although this conference is specifically concerned with large colleges and universities, most all of the discussions that have taken place could have occurred at a conference

for representatives of smaller institutions of the size, for example of Goddard and Denison. This characteristic of the conference may emerge from the fact that the problems and opportunities we face are universal. On the contrary it is, I believe, clear that the huge university has special problems which emerge from size and also special and tremendous resources which are available in such institutions. We have given minimal attention to such distinctions.

4. <u>The "drop-in student"</u>. A member of a discussion group on Wednesday afternoon suggested that we have neglected the "drop-in" student - that is, the student who transfers from another institution. We have tended to assume a unitary program and failed to recognize the effect that transfer students may have on innovative programs or the effect that such programs may have on these students. Transfer students are numerically important in many of our large universities. At my own university, UCLA, the majority of our graduating seniors are transfer students, most of them from junior colleges. The reality of this situation is, of course, recognized at Florida Atlantic University which limits its offerings to upper division, graduate, and professional work.

5. <u>Resources available here</u>. We have given minimal attention to some of the resources available at this conference. In making this statement, I do not have in mind resources at Michigan State University. These have generously been made available and utilized within the time limits available. What I have in mind are some of the materials specifically prepared for our use at this conference.

A story is told of a Southern minister who was asked for the plan he followed in preparing a sermon. Came his reply, "First, I choose my text; then I announce my text; then I leave my text; and finally I never return to it."

In my judgment we have essentially given this treatment to some of the materials prepared for and presented to us here. Specifically, I refer to the paper by Ray Carpenter - a soundly conceived, design-centered paper with notable implications for our thinking and for our institutions - and yet a paper which received minimal attention and discussion.

Somewhat similar comments might be made about the potential values of the abstracts on innovations.

Problems

There has been no dearth of problems this week. I shall refer to eight areas around which some of these problems cluster.

1. One group of problems cluster around the nature of man, the purposes of education, and the role of the university. The papers prepared and distributed at the conference gave little attention to this area. There has nevertheless been notable interest and concern by conferees about the resolution of problems and issues in this area as basically essential to planning innovations.

2. A second group of problems are centered around the frustrations, needs, and goals of students in our lockstep universities. Students

in large numbers report that they have little time or opportunity to read, to think, or - in the finest sense - to learn. We teach for purposes of regurgitation and we get regurgitation. Students are under tremendous pressures to get grades which will keep them out of the armed services, will admit them to graduate school, or will help them get the employment they seek. Grades, not learning, are the goal of students. In brief, the task of the student is to determine what the old buzzard wants and give it to him.

3. A third cluster of problems relates to faculty members. Professors are variously seen as self-satisfied with their teaching - or upon occasion bored with what they are doing - but with little incentive to change. Repeatedly this week professors have been referred to as obstacles to innovation.

4. Closely related and of concern to many faculty members is the usual university policy of publish or perish. The faculty member knows that his promotion is dependent upon his research and publication - not upon the kind or quality of his teaching and certainly not upon his launching curricular or instructional innovations. The system encourages the faculty member to be a determent to innovation.

5. Although curriculum problems have received but little attention, their importance is recognized at the conference. Among decisions which must be made are identifying courses which meet the requirements of students, determining the substantive content of courses, and resolving issues regarding interdisciplinary offerings.

6. Problems of university planning require attention. Where are we going? Why? At what rate? How? What about faculty involvement? Student involvement? What innovations can we plan? How can we provide for a flexibility in plant construction which will permit adoption of innovations of which we have not yet dreamed?

7. Problems concerning teaching and learning have repeatedly been raised and discussed. Stressed have been the importance and difficulty of achieving student involvement. Motivation, personalization, and individualization of instruction have been identified as problems as well as values.

8. A cluster of problems are associated with the processes of using the products of our new technology - and of technologies yet to come - as an aid to achieving our instructional purposes. What are the special problems of producing materials for electronic media? What should be the roles of the professor in the age of our new technology? What is the TNT mix - the mix of technology and togetherness? How can we identify the tasks which the computer can best do - as distinguished from those best performed by man or by other learning materials? How can the facilities and resources of our new technology best be made available to students and professors?

These are among the problems which I have noted as we have met together this week.

Issues

From our discussions and in some cases from the problems we have noted - emerge a variety of issues. I shall refer to only three.

1. The nature of this conference. This week we have faced issues regarding what the focus of this conference is and should be. At times our agenda have been hidden; at other times they have been over-obvious. It is clear that the conference we have held is quite different from the conference that was projected by the Planning Committee. The conference that was planned - as this is reflected in the papers and abstracts which were distributed to us - was action-centered. The conference that was actually held had a duality of focus: First, and perhaps dominantly, in the commitments and drives of conferees, an emphasis on the roles and purposes of the university as an essential prerequisite to valid innovation; and, second, a stress on action-projecting and launching innovations.

It is my impression that most of us came to Michigan State expecting to participate in an explicitly action-centered conference. That such a conference did not eventuate has been a relief to some, a disappointment to others. As I have examined the materials that were distributed to us, I have been intrigued with the possibility of summarizing the conference "that might have been." I should like to share my four sentence efforts with you:

a. Changes in society desirably impel changes in our universities.

b. Computers can contribute to the improvement of research, counseling, administration and teaching in our universities - to a degree in today's "horse and buggy' days of computer development and vastly in the coming age of the computer.

c. New and revolutionary technological resources are eminently appropriate and applicable - when used with a mix of human resources - to the solution of many, if not most, problems which confront large and growing universities.

d. Formal and informal channels of communication, the establishment of a department of continuous renewal, the development of personnel policies that support innovative approaches to educational problems, and continuing evaluation and feedback can lead to a self-renewing university.

Supplemented by analysis and elaboration, by the formulation of a pattern of schematic design, and by examples of specific innovative practices for consideration in attempting to achieve particular objectives, these four sentences could, I submit, summarize the conference that might have been.

I call your attention to the fact that the role and purpose of the university is not a matter of moment in the summary. Rather the focus is on the processes of achieving purposes - such purposes not defined, however, in the conference that might have been.

Over and against the position suggested by the "might have been" summary that I have proposed is the view of those conferees - also committed to

innovation and improvement - who hold that to take innovative action prior to rigorous re-examination of the role and purposes of the university will retard rather than advance the causes of change to which all members of this conference are committed.

Some conferees might well have found an entirely different type of conference more valuable - one patterned somewhat after last spring's National Conference on the Nature of the University which was held in Beverly Hills under the sponsorship of the Center for Democratic Institutions.

As a consequence of the issue which I have been discussing, this conference may very well be in disfavor by holders of both positions. On the other hand, we may have achieved a desirable mix, a useful balance.

2. Segmental innovation versus reconstruction of the university.

This is an issue that we have confronted repeatedly and continuously. On the one hand, there are those who hold that innovative developments must start on a small scale. The professor and the individual department are central forces of change under this concept. Those who hold this view are pessimistic about transforming an entire university. They believe, however, that a small beginning may lead to maximum achievement. "Large oaks from acorns grow.", they suggest.

For those who support this position, the example of Samuel Postlethwait of Purdue University has been quoted. Using an audio-tutorial method of teaching botany, which he has developed over a period of years, Professor Postlethwait has influenced teaching in many colleges

and universities - and on Wednesday we were informed of his influence on national legislation.

On the contrary, there are those who suggest that nothing less than reconstruction will do. Indeed one conferee asserts, "I would not simply build a new university, I would build a new city - a new community."

For those who hold these views, many of the proposals made here are mere cosmetics or at best face-lifting.

At the conference there are also, perhaps, those who would start small and hopefully and gradually move to a completely reconstructed university.

3. Mechanized versus personalized education. Underlying much of our discussion is a fear that we may be about to substitute a mechanized, depersonalized education - characterized by computers, IBM cards, technological hardware - for our present somewhat more personalized procedures. On the one hand, we have been urged to have a give-and-take in teaching-learning, a process in which both student and teacher learn; we have had suggested the values of dialogue focusers-scholars who identify as a basis for discussion agreements and disagreements among leaders on the cutting edge of disciplines.

In contradistinction to this position we are told that today's typical lecture section is as depersonalized as education can get and that technological aids can actually lead to increased personalization by

releasing the professor from duties the machine can perform so that he may spend more time with the student in dialogue, conference, and confrontation.

You may have a longer and different list of issues which for you have emerged from the conference. These three are, however, among those which impressed me.

Suggestions

Because this has not explicitly been an action-centered conference, fewer suggestions and recommendations have emerged from our week's discussions than might have been anticipated. In addition, many of the best ideas from the conference have undoubtedly come from informal visiting over cocktails, at dinner and in the lounge - at sessions which no single member of the conference could attend. Accordingly, I feel somewhat limited as I outline four types of suggestions that have emerged from this conference:

Suggestions usually made at conferences on higher education.

Suggestions to universities designed to encourage innovative planning and development.

Suggestions of specific innovations for universities.

Suggestions to the United States Office of Education and other agencies.

We have had made here a group of suggestions that are typically made at conferences on higher education. Perhaps they are redundant. Perhaps they

are repeated because they haven't been tried, or because they have been tried and are helpful. Here are a few of these usual proposals:

Use student opinion forms as an aid to improving instruction and other aspects of the university program.

Publish and distribute student critiques of courses.

Initiate a program of faculty development - pointed toward participation in innovative plans.

Hold a seminar on higher education and teaching for teaching assistants, for graduate students preparing to teach, and upon occasion for faculty members.

Two types of suggestions are made to universities: First, suggestions which encourage and may lead to innovation; and second, suggestions regarding specific innovations.

Among suggestions which may lead to innovation are these:

Conduct within the university a dialogue on the role and purposes of the university - such a dialogue to serve as a foundation for innovative planning and to involve administrators, professors, and students.

Establish a center for innovation in the president's or provost's office with funds available to support innovations proposed by professors.

Develop a system of faculty incentives which will encourage their involvement in innovative developments and which will combat restrictive obstacles of the publish or perish syndrome.

Establish a faculty cabinet, committee or council on educational change.

Involve students in educational planning through use of student-faculty committees, conferences, and dialogues.

Have a qualified staff member assigned responsibility for assisting faculty members in the preparation of proposals for funding innovative projects for submission to the United States Office of Education and foundations.

Innovations suggested include these:

Establish a vast instructional resource center which will encompass the library, the computer center, the audio-visual center, and the center for producing instructional materials.

Make studies of instructional mix - man and machine - in varied disciplines to determine what "the machine" can and cannot do.

Make studies of the varied roles of the professor and in particular matching different professors to different roles for which they are best qualified and in which they are most interested.

Initiate plans through the counseling and testing service to enroll students in classes or sections consistent with their particular characteristics, including, for example, their capacity for verbal, visual, and tactile learning.

Initiate plans of independent study. At last month's meeting of the American Council on Education, President Esther Raushenbush of Sarah Lawrence College discussed this proposal. She observed that if a plan of independent study requires an undue amount of the professor's time one of two conditions exist - either the plan is not independent study, or students have not been prepared for assuming the responsibility of studying independently.

Try out T-group and sensitivity training groups among both faculty and students. It is suggested that this plan which is widely used in business, government, and industry may contribute to the improvement of instruction and to the personalization of teaching.

Encourage faculty members to engage in systems approaches to teaching which include specifically defining purposes, providing learning activities designed to achieve purposes, evaluating outcomes on the basis of purposes and providing feedback.

Engage in cooperative studies of innovations between and among universities. Representative of this type of undertaking is a cooperative plan for an instructional systems development and its evaluation which has been launched by Michigan State University in cooperation with Syracuse University, Ohio University, University of Colorado and California State College at Hayward.

Suggestions to the United States Office of Education include these:

Be generous in funding proposals from universities of the types involved in the listing which I have just reported.

Hold additional conferences designed to stimulate sound innovation in higher education. Varied suggestions have been made for such conferences. These include: study the role and purpose of the university; project the planning and development of a utopian university; invite professors rather than professional innovators.

Make grants to universities which provide academic vice presidents with discretionary funds they can use to support innovative proposals from faculty members.

Evaluate conferences on innovation that have been held, including the present one, on the basis of their outcomes. Such outcomes might well include the formulation and funding of innovative projects judged to be significant. Evaluation should seek to identify characteristics of conferences that are or are not related to their success.

Conferences such as this are costly. They are expensive not only in terms of dollars and cents - coming to and attending - but also in terms of the time and energy of those who attend and prepare papers. They must be evaluated.

Make or encourage another agency to make a study of undergraduate departments - in universities which are distinguished for teaching.

Conclusion

I conclude as I make four points.

1. An emphasis that has been implicit but not explicit in all that we have said here. Innovation for the sake of innovation has no place in the American university. The only possible reason for innovative developments is improvement. This viewpoint has prevailed throughout our sessions. I suggest, however, that we make this view explicit and emphasize it in all that we may do.

2. A proposal for group consideration. Here for the last week we have been a group. We are now about to depart for home where most of us will be solo performers in innovation. I would like to suggest a possible continuing loose organization which could facilitate an interchange of experiences and problems and the possible encouragement of cooperative studies. Perhaps this proposal can be considered by the conference or by the Planning Committee for the conference.

3. A suggestion to members of the conference. I have been impressed with the paucity of use we have made of the abstracts of innovations which have been placed in our hands. Perhaps their greatest value will be achieved if they are taken home and made available to colleagues as a possible aid to stimulating innovations. Also I would like to see steps taken to secure a wider distribution of these abstracts - either in their present form or after editing as a published monograph.

4. A suggestion to each university represented at the conference. I would like to urge that every university represented here appoint a vice president in charge of heresy. Advanced in a somewhat different context in a lecture by Philip H. Coombs at UCLA in 1960,[2] this proposal

---

2. Philip H. Coombs. The Technical Frontiers of Education. The twenty-seventh Sir John Adams Lecture at the University of California, Los Angeles, March 15, 1960. Los Angeles: School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, 1960. pp. 14-15.

would provide a staff member - with no administrative responsibility - whose duty it would be to keep abreast of national developments and to initiate plans for exploiting them at his institution, as well as to develop entirely new plans for local use. Our vice president would be a dreamer. He would assemble "far out" proposals. He would needle administrators and his faculty colleagues and in turn be needled by them. In universities of the size here represented he would hopefully have associated with him a cabinet or council of heretics. Our vice president and his associates would be instigators of change. We need to be bold. Why not a vice president in charge of heresy? And who knows - it may be he who takes leadership in building our University of Utopia.[3]

---

3. See also B. Lamar Johnson. Islands of Innovation. Occasional Report Number 6 from UCLA Junior College Leadership Program. Los Angeles: School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, 1964, pp. 14-15, 25.